

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
FINAL UTILITY ORDERS
Selected for Publication
August 2002

August 5, 2002

In the Matter of Disaggregation
of Federal Universal Support of

ASOTIN TELEPHONE
COMPANY, ET AL

and

Joint Petition of

CENTURYTEL OF
WASHINGTON, INC., and
CENTURYTEL OF INTER
ISLAND, INC. (collectively
CENTURYTEL),

For Approval of USF
Disaggregation plan

DOCKET NOS. UT-013058 AND UT-023020

ORDER REJECTING DISAGGREGATION
FILINGS

Disaggregation, or the assignment of federal universal support money to geographic areas less than a company's study area, incumbent local exchange carriers ("ILECs") for areas served by rural ILECs must be done at the exchange level based on the methodology developed in 1998, because this methodology is transparent; results in a reasonable disaggregation of federal universal service support; and, will result in a fair per-line amount of support flowing to competitors who serve customers in exchanges identified with rural ILECs. Furthermore, this methodology permits rural ILECs to receive 100% of their annual support amount. ¶32.

Rural ILECs receive adequate universal service support funding to allow them to prepare geographic exchange maps of a type that will allow competitors to locate customers within rural exchanges and enable competitors to make accurate claims for support. ¶¶35-37; 47 C.F.R. §54.315.

August 19, 2002

In re the Petition of

DOCKET NO. UT-020667

WASHINGTON
INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE
ASSOCIATION

ORDER DECLINING TO ENTER
DECLARATORY ORDER

For a Declaratory Order on the
Use of Virtual NPA/NXX
Calling Patterns

The Commission may not enter a declaratory order that would prejudice the rights of a necessary party who does not consent in writing to a determination by means of a declaratory order. ¶19; *RCW 34.05.240(7)*; *In the Matter of the Petition of AT&T Communications of the Pacific Northwest, Inc. for Declaratory Order Regarding Responsibilities of the Designated Toll Carrier*, Docket No. UT-961012 (October 30, 1996).

A necessary party is one who has a sufficient interest in the litigation that the judgment cannot be determined without affecting that interest or leaving it unresolved. ¶19; *CR19(a)*; *Harvey v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 90 Wn.2d 473, 474 (1978).